

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X		
ALEJANDRO HUGGINS, on behalf of	:	
himself and others similarly situated,	:	
	:	
<i>Plaintiffs,</i>	:	18 Civ. 1037 (PAC)
	:	
<i>-against-</i>	:	<u>ORDER</u>
	:	
CHESTNUT HOLDINGS INC.; 1425 U	:	
LLC; and JONATHAN WIENER,	:	
	:	
<i>Defendants.</i>	:	
-----X		

HONORABLE PAUL A. CROTTY, United States District Judge:

This Order resolves two outstanding matters in this case that began more than two-and-a-half years ago.

The Plaintiffs move to compel depositions of certain witnesses under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 30(b)(6). Dkt. 83, at 1, 3. That motion is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part. The Parties are ordered to meet and confer on a discovery schedule by October 2, 2020. That schedule is to include the production of the Defendants' 30(b)(6) witnesses. The Parties will submit their schedule to the Court by 5 p.m. on that date. If the Parties cannot reach an agreement, the Plaintiffs may renew their motion to compel for prompt consideration by the Court.

As to the Plaintiffs' motion requesting that the Defendants be ordered to produce identifications for issuance of notice for “all current and former superintendents of all residential apartment buildings owned and operated’ by Defendants,” Dkt. 86, at 1, that application is GRANTED in full. Defendants will produce “a complete list of superintendents

potentially belonging to the collective proposed by Plaintiffs as ordered by the Court.” Dkt. 86, at 1.

The collective conditionally certified by the Court in its May 29, 2020 Order, Dkt. 72, was the proposed collective identified in the Plaintiffs' motion papers for conditional certification, encompassing:

current and former superintendents of all residential apartment buildings owned and operated by Chestnut Holdings of New York Inc. (“Chestnut Holdings”), 1425 U LLC, Jonathan Wiener, individually, and any related entities (all, collectively where appropriate, as “Defendants”) who, while performing work for Defendants at any time between February 6, 2012, and the present, were not paid at least the minimum wage rate for all hours worked and/or overtime compensation for all hours over forty that they worked in a workweek[.]

Dkt. 62, at 1. The Defendants—who showed none of their present bewilderment about the definition of the conditionally certified collective on their motion for reconsideration, which was denied—are ordered to produce without further delay identifications for issuance of notice for the collective as it was proposed by the Plaintiffs and conditionally certified by the Court. *Id.*; Dkt. 72.

The Clerk of Court is directed to close the motions at Dockets 83 and 86.

Dated: New York, New York
September 22, 2020

SO ORDERED



PAUL A. CROTTY
United States District Judge